



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

EDO
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/765,520	01/17/2001	Patrick E. Feierabend	OC0100US	9519
22849	7590	07/09/2003		
SCOTT W HEWETT			EXAMINER	
400 WEST THIRD STREET			SANGHAVI, HEMANG	
#223				
SANTA ROSA, CA 95401				
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2874	

DATE MAILED: 07/09/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/765,520	FEIERABEND ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Hemang Sanghavi	2874

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 April 2003.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-51 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 24-51 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) 23 is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,7 and 12-17, 22 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 2-6,8-11 and 18-21 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>2,4</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election without traverse of the invention (Group I, claims 1-23) in Paper No. 6 is acknowledged.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by MacDonald (US 2002/0017834).

MacDonald discloses an actuated MEMS device comprising a base portion of a die, a pivoting member with a hinge, a mirror having a mirror surface essentially parallel to the major surface, the mirror being integrated with the pivoting member; and an actuator disposed to rotate the pivoting member to move the mirror from a fist switch position to a second switch position. See [0063] at page 4, [00115] at page 8, and Figs. 11a, 11b, and 15.

Claims 1, 7, 12-15 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Behin et al (US 2001/0050801).

Behin et al discloses a MEMS device comprising a base portion of a die, a pivoting member with a hinge, a mirror having a mirror surface essentially parallel to the major surface, the mirror being integrated with the pivoting member; and an actuator disposed to rotate the pivoting member to move the mirror from a first switch position to a second switch position. See Abstract and Fig. 2. The mirror also includes a magnetic rib, which is a thicker portion of the mirror. As stated at section [0032], the single-crystal silicon layer has thickness of 50 microns.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 16-17 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Behin et al.

Behin et al, as discussed above, fails to disclose a thickness of the rib section being 40 microns and the thickness of the thinner section of the mirror being 20 microns.

However, achieving optimum thickness for the mirror and the rib section would require routine experimentation.

Lacking criticality in the specification as the thickness of the mirror and the rib section, the ordinary artisan would have found it to be obvious at the time of the invention to achieve optimum thickness for the mirror and the rib section (thicker portion) performing routine experimentation.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 23 is allowed over the prior art of record.

Claims 2-6, 8-11 and 18-21 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Wood et al, Chiu et al, and Huibers et al disclose different types of MEMS devices.

The prior art submitted by applicant has been considered. See attached copy of form PTO-1449.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hemang Sanghavi whose telephone number is 703-

305-3484. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday (8:30 AM-6:00 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rodney Bovernick can be reached on 703-308-4819. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9318 for regular communications and 703-872-9319 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.



Hemang Sanghavi
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2874

hs
June 30, 2003